



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,014	02/10/2004	Jerry A. Culp	INST490DIV4	9084
51017	7590	03/18/2008	EXAMINER	
INTEL. PROP./RND			TRUONG, KEVIN THAO	
STRYKER CORPORATION				
4100 EAST MILHAM AVE.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
KALMAZOO, MI 49001-6197			3734	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/776,014	CULP ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin T. Truong	3734	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 97-123 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 103,114 and 122 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 97-102, 104-113, 115-121 and 123 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/04</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of claims 97-102, 104-113, 115-121 and 123 in the reply filed on 11/14/2007 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 97-102, 104-113, 115-121 and 123 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-47 of U.S. Patent No. 6,752,816. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the relatively subject matter claimed such surgical handpiece having a power generating unit; an accessory connected to the

power unit; a memory containing data; and a console includes driver, control unit configured to read and retain the data stored in the handpiece memory, in the instant application which would have been obvious in view of the relatively subject matter of the patent claims.

4. Claims 97-102, 104-113, 115-121 and 123 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-36 of U.S. Patent No. 6,090,123. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the relatively subject matter claimed such surgical handpiece having a power generating unit; an accessory connected to the power unit; a memory containing data; and a console includes driver, control unit configured to read and retain the data stored in the handpiece memory, in the instant application which would have been obvious in view of the relatively subject matter of the patent claims.

5. Claims 97-102, 104-113, 115-121 and 123 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-37 of U.S. Patent No. 6,017,354. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the relatively subject matter claimed such surgical handpiece having a power generating unit; an accessory connected to the power unit; a memory containing data; and a console includes driver, control unit configured to read and retain the data stored in the handpiece memory, in the instant application which would have been obvious in view of the relatively subject matter of the patent claims.

6. Claims 97-102, 104-113, 115-121 and 123 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-40 of U.S. Patent No. 6,329,778. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the relatively subject matter claimed such surgical handpiece having a power generating unit; an accessory connected to the power unit; a memory containing data; and a console includes driver, control unit configured to read and retain the data stored in the handpiece memory, in the instant application which would have been obvious in view of the relatively subject matter of the patent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 97-102, 104-113, 115-121 and 123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rexroth (U.S. 5,269,794).

Rexroth discloses substantially as claimed in figures 1-23, a plurality of surgical handpieces, each of said handpiece includes a power generating unit; memory contain data for regulating the application of the energization signal to the power generating unit; a console having a plurality of sockets for removably connected to the handpiece; a driver configured to supply energization signals to the power generating unit; a control unit connected to the sockets for reading data in the

handpiece memories and being connected to the driver; a sensor for providing a sensor signal used to regulate the actuation of the power generating unit; wherein the control unit is capable of read and retain from each of the handpieces memory so that the control unit contains the data from the plural handpiece memories; determine if one of the handpiece is to be actuated and for the handpiece to be actuated, based on the sensor signal from the handpiece and the previously retained sensor signal correction data, regulate the generation of the energization signal output by the driver for application to the power generating unit of the handpiece.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin T. Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-4705. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM..

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kevin T. Truong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3734

ktt